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What’s new?

• The draft got adopted by the WG
• Content changes
  • Added policy creation via BGP
  • Introduction now highlights pseudowires (PWE3, PALS) as typical use case
  • Reworded the “bandwidth” section to not use the word “commitment”
  • Various editorial changes
CS-SR Policy Creation via BGP

- CS-SR policy creation is initiated by a central controller performing:
  - Path calculation
  - Bandwidth bookkeeping
- Bidirectional, co-routing and diversity candidate path constraints are known by the controller and don’t need to be signalled
- Policy creation per draft-ietf-idr-segment-routing-te-policy
  - SR policy NLRI
  - Multiple NLRIs with different distinguishers in case of 1:R, 1:1 or 1:1:R protection/restoration being used
- State reporting by headend routers per draft-ietf-idr-bgp-ls-sr-policy
  - C flag = 1 to indicate candidate paths are provisioned by a controller
  - A flag = 1 to indicate when a candidate path is active and carrying traffic
  - B flag = 1 to indicate when a candidate path is a backup path
Worth to note

• New bit-stream pseudowires are expected to be a key use case for CS-SR
  • draft-ietf-pals-ple
  • [UPDATED] draft-schmutzer-bess-bitstream-vpws-signalling
  • [NEW] draft-schmutzer-pals-ple-signaling
Next Steps

• Further comments and review of recent changes are welcome